[Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari]

people of India and told him that we were looking forward to his visit which would have a historical character and be an important landmark in the development of our relations. I also apprised him of my talks in Western Europe regarding the application of comprehensive sanctions against the Pretoria regime. I also referred to the situation in various regions of Asia and the world and India's efforts to promote peace, friendship and cooperation with its neighbours. Mr. Gorbachev told me categorically that the Soviet Union's friendship towards India is not a subject of expendiency or a result of outside pressure. It has its own high intrinsic value. Our relations are deeply rooted in our hearts and minds. I expressed to Mr. Gorbachev our high appreciation of Indo-Soviet collaboratin in the economic commercial, scientific, technological, cultural and other fields. We agreed that India and the Soviet Union would go ahead with accelerated cooperation in science and technology.

Sir, I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my high appreciation of the coordiality, hospitality and the free, friendly and warm exchange of views which I had with Soviet leaders. I also had talks with Mr. Katyushea Chairman of the State Committee for Economic Relations and Mr. Kamentsev, Deputy Prime Minister, with special reference to our economic, technical, and scientific relations. There was full understanding on all issues and I am glad to state that we look forward very keenly to the visit of General Secretary Gorbachev and his delegation and I am confident that the visit will prove an important landmark in the further development and strengthening of our bilateral relations as well as producing a healthy and positive influence in international affairs.

II. Visit of the Minister of External Affairs as Members of the Group of Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers on Comprehensive sanctions against South Africa

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI): Sir, the Heads of State or Government of Nonaligned countries decided, at their 8th Summit meeting in Harare, to mandate the Foreign Ministers of Zimbabwe, India, Yugoslavia, Peru, Argentina, Nigeria, Congo and Algeria to visit key industrial countries to press them to agree to the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South africa.

As a member of this Group of Nonaligned Foreign Ministers, I visited Rome, Brussels, Paris, London, Bonn and Tokyo to carry out the Harare mandate.

In each of these European countries we visted during the last week of October, and in the first week of November, 1986, we had prolonged meetings with their Foreign Ministers. In Japan, we were received by Prime Minister Nakasone in addition to our meetings with the Foreigh Minister of Japan.

In all our discussions, we indicated that we bring a strong and unanimous message from 101 Heads of State of Nonaligned countries to press them to consider imposition of comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions on South Africa. While we recognised that each of those countries had moved some way towards imposing a few sanctions, we did not think that the package adopted by those countries was sufficient to meet the demands of the situation.

We conveyed the NAM assessment that the situation in South Africa and Namibia was deteriorating rapidly. To arrest this deteriorating

situation and to achieve the objective of eliminating apartheid, the Nonaligned Heads of State believed that urgent efforts shoul be made by the world community to bring about an end to apartheid in South Africa. Since all other attempts to end apartheid had failed, and there was increasing pressure to seek military solutions, the only peaceful alternative left for the world community was imposition of comprehensive economic sanctions. We urged the Governments of these industrialised countries to immediately impose comprehensive sanctions and to agree to make them mondatory under chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. We told them that continuance of apartheid was the key moral issue facing our generation. We emphasised that their commitment to human rights and dignity, and their attempts to bring about human rights in different parts of the world, would remain hollow and motivated if they do not take immediate steps to end the pernicious doctrine and practice of apartheid. We pointed out that comprehensive sanctions would need to be imposed immediately if a disaster of gigantic proportions in Southern Africa was to be averted.

I emphasised to them that India banned all trade with South Africa long ago in 1946 at a time when India's exports to South Africa were 5.6 per cent of its total exports. Even though the ban on trade involved considerable sacrifices on our part, we were willing to shoulder its consequences because of our commitment to fundamental human rights, to democracy and to freedom everywhere and our support for the struggling people of Africa.

We found that there was a coinci dence of similarily in the responses given by the Foreign Ministers of the countries we visited. They share our abhorrence for apartheid and agree that it cannot be reformed and must be abolished. Their assessment regarding the deteriorating situation in Southern Africa and its potential for violence and bloodshed were similar to ours. While the goals were similar, they differed with us on the manner in which these goals could be achieved. They had not given up hope of arranging a political dialogue within South Africa through persuasion and felt that limited voluntary sanctions would nudge the South African regime to negotiate with the majority. They said that they opposed mandatory sanctions under the United Nations Charter as a matter of principle. They argued that comprehensive sanctions could make the white South African regime more intransigent and much less willing to negotiate.

Some of them tried to argue that comprehensive sanctions would be unworkable. We pointed out that in the face of overwhelming evidence that sanctions had worked in other situations and with other countries against whom some of the Western countries had not hesitated to impose sanctions, this argument should not be prossed.

There are strong vested interests within the industrialised countries wishing to maintain trade and economic links with the white South African regime. The initiative of the Heads of Governments of the Nonaligned countries and the visit of the Group of Foreign Ministers has undoubtedly focussed attention on this most important issue of our times. I believe that our efforts will strengthen not only those within the governments who have a more liberal outlook on human rights and who show greater concern in regard to the situation in Southern Africa but will also encourage the strong public opinion which exists in Europe in favour of definitive action to end apartheid.

The decision of the Prime Minister to send me to joint the delegation

[Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari]

even though I had just taken overas External Affairs Minister symbolises our country's decisive commitment to nonalignment and the principled unanimous stand of our parliament on the South African issue. Our policy in regard to apartheid remains clear and firm that it is absolutely immoral and has to be demolished at the earliest. The world community must not allow itself to be diverted by short term economic or political considerations from availing itself of the only peaceful option now left by imposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the UN Charter to bring about an early end to apartheid. The Nonaligned Movement has, for the first time, opened a dialogue with the industrialised countries on this key moral issue. It is our firm belief that this dialogue should continue and the Nonaligned Movement should play its due role in bringing about a peaceful change in South Africa and Namibia. I am sure that these efforts will continue to have the full support of the Hon. Members of this august House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Now, Mr. Nirmal Chatterjee.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, the visits to both the Soviet Union and the industrialised countries of the world can really be linked up in one piece and the approach content of the Government as represented by our new External Affairs Minister is certainly welcome. In the statement, Sir, I find a sentence, perhaps, for the first time: "There are strong vested interests within the industrialised countries wishing to maintain trade and economic links with the White South African regime." Sir, I thank him for this because this is a statement which goes beyond the initial perception that it is merely a racial issue, that it is merely an issue between the Blacks and the Whites of the world. In fact, Sir, if I am permitted to say so, even this distinction between the blacks and the whites is basically related to the economic motivation of the multi-nationals in all these countries. Very recently, Sir, I was reading that only a few multi-nationals in these developed countries, along with the United States and Japan, control 40 per cent of world trade. You can imagine the tremendous amount of influence that they exercise. It is not only, Sir, that their vested interests do not permit them to withdraw from South Africa in terms of aid, in terms of trade and in terms of all kinds of assistance, but South Africa, in fact along with certain other out-posts like Pakistan and Israel, is being utilised as vantage point by the world multi-nationals, particularly of the United States, which country our Minister did not find time to visit, perhaps giving up all hope of persuading them, and this kind of perception I just want to mention because in this statement, perhaps inadvertantly, the External Affairs Minister has said that 101 Heads of States are opposed to it; I would have liked it to be amended by the "Heads of States along with the entire people of these countries". This perception of the conflict of interests between the people of the world and these of the multinationals and their frontline State, that is, the United States, has to be adequately understood by the people of all countries of the world, including these industrialised countries which he has visited. In fact, Sir, it is this—I want to know from the Minister also subsequently—it is this really really which units the perception of the USSR with regard to peace and war with that of India.

But, Sir, there is just one question that I want to ask in this regard: Is it the perception of the External Affairs that because of the nature of present-day multi-nationals and capitalism, of necessity—it is not volitional—of necessity that these States have to plan for war and, as a part of

the plan for disturbing peace, have to sustain South Africa and Isreal partly. So has the kind of perception I have mentioned ever arisen in his discussions with General Secretary Gorbachov of the USSR?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Mr. Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the present is not the occasion to go into a detailed discussion on the governments perceptions about the developing international situation, etc. The whole clarification is limited to the hon. Minister's tour of industrialised countries and his visit to the capital of the Soviet Union. I would just like to make two observations before I seek a clarification. One is that a statement by the Prime Minister on his visit to the South-East Asia, etc. is long overdue. It is courteous of the hon. Minister to have come forward so readily and so soon after these visits, with this statement. But we are still waiting for the Prime Minister to enlighten us what he actually did or did not do when he was in Australia and New Zealand.

Secondly, I have had the occasion to request the Chairman that because throughout this year we have not had a chance to discuss substantially the foreign policy of this Government, perhaps before this session concludes we ought to be given that opportunity.

It is indeed very interesting tour that the Minister of External Affairs has had. My first question is about the statement on his visit to Moscow which is really more in the nature of eulogies and the routine niceties of diplomacy. There is really little of substance about what actually transpired in Moscow. The visit of the General Secretary is now due, as close as almost within a fortnight. I would, therefore, like to ask two clarifications on his visit to Moscow. The first is about the Reykjavik talks. There is a reason why I ask this. I would like to know whether Rejkjavik talks featured during the hon. Minister's visit to Moscow. The reason why I specifically mention this is that a very important event has taken place in Iceland and the only formal statement on that subject, as far as the Government of India is concerned, is an impromptu remark made by the Prime Minister on his return from Australia. Perhaps, today is a good occasion for the Government to come forward. If not today, the Government must come forward at the earliest possible pportunity with a substantive statement on Reykjavik talks. Therefore, I am making this request to the hon. Minister. Would he enlighten us whether this great event featured in his discussions with General Secretary, Gorbachev?

My second clarification in respect of his visit to Moscow is about the agenda. Surely by now the Government of India has an agenda of the General Secretary's visit. One of the things you must have discussed in Moscow is the agenda of the visit. Would you perhaps like to give us the details of that agenda?

In respect of the second statement about the hon. Minister's visit to various industrialised countries, I don't think there is anybody either in this House or the other House who has any doubt about what your attitude or your articulation of policy is, as far as that obscenity which is apartheid is concerned. It is really about the effectiveness of our policy that I am concerned with. I won't go into the debate which did surface even in Harare because that ought really to be left for a more meaningful discussion of foreign policy or a debate. About universal, comprehensive and mandatory sanctions there is some confusion. The alternative in Harare was voluntary and selective sanctions etc. as used by some of the frontline States themselves. But I shall not into that

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

because that would be sidetracking the issue. My specific question is about the fund that has to be raised. As India is the Chairman of this Committee that has been formed about the Fund, I am frankly apprehensive about the exercise which has been launched under India's chairmanship. I am apprehensive because of the knowledge of the fate that was met by the Save Namibia Fund. Therefore, I want to ask just two precise questions in respect of the fund. How does India, as Chairman, intend to collect this fund and, thereafter, how do you intend to administer it? Thank you.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at the outset, let me welcome the Foreign Minister after his long visit abroad. Lately, there has been a large turnover of Foreign Ministers. I hope Mr. Tiwari will have a longer tenure so that he will remember the names of all the Heads of State and Foreign Ministers.

Sir, this statement is a little deceptive. I am talking of the Minister's visit to Rome, Brussels, Paris, London, Bonn and Tokyo in connection with the Harare mandate. Sir, at one place, in para 7, he says that "We found that there was a coincidence of similarity in the responses given by the Foreign Ministers of the countries we visited. They share our abhorrence for apartheid and agree that it cannot be reformed and must be abolished." I do not know how the hon. Minister has got this impression that all these countries share our strong abhorrence for apartheid and they want it to be abolished. If they really wanted it to be abolished, they would not have taken such a rigid stand against sanctions against South Africa. In the next two sentences, he only reiterates their stand that they are against the sanctions. Therefore, there is nothing new in the Minister's statement or what the Group of Ministers have achieved by their visit to various countries. Of particular significance is the attitude of the Great Britain. I wish the Minister had mentioned about it as to what exactly is the reaction of the British Government to another pleading in favour of economic sanctions because it is the Great Britain which has been standing in the way of effective economic sanctions against South Africa so far. There is no mention about that. Similarly, though this mission has nothing to do with the creation of Africa Fund, it has great relevance in the sense that it is a very positive step which the Non-aligned Movement has taken to help the Frontline African States. When another Minister of State is looking after that. He has also visited a number of States. I hope the Minister would, in his reply, clarify what exactly is being done in that respect.

Sir, in the second statement, the hon. Minister mentioned about his talks in Moscow. And I wish he had mentioned something about the Soviet Union's continued adherence to the stand taken at Reykjavik summit. Though there are public statements by Mr. Gorbachov that the Soviet Union stands by the commitment it made and the far-reaching proposals it made at Reykjavik, it is necessary again to re-iterate our request to the Soviet Union to adhere to these proposals in spite of the the obduracy displayed by the United States in rejecting such proposals from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has gone very far in the Reykjavik summit towards nuclear disarmament. But, unfortunately, a golden chance was missed because of the rigid stand taken by the US President. I would like to know what exactly the Minister discussed and the Soviet Union's continued stand on the proposals made by them at Reykjavik.

Secondly, Sir, the Soviet Union has taken another major step recently by withdrawing some of its armed

forces from Afghanistan. We are interested in this because in the name of meeting the Soviet presence in Afghanistan the United States is arming Pakistan to a large extent causing great unrest in this country and forcing us also to arm ourselves to meet the threat. I want to know whether this also has figured in his talks and whether the Soviet Union has assured further withdrawals from Afghanistan so that the situation in this sub-continent can ease.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in the light of the speech made this morning by the Minister of State for External Affairs and the environment encompassing our country at the moment, the statement by Mr. Gorbachov as quoted by our hon. Minister is welcome. He said and I quote: "Mr. Gorbachov told me categorically that the Soviet Union's friendship towards India is not a subject of expediency or a result of outside pressure. It has its own high intrinsic value." This is highly welcome and we appreciate this statement very much. Now Mr. Gorbachov is coming. I hope the hon. Minister will assure us that this policy will be made known in a very firm manner on both sides when Mr. Gorbachov comes over here. The second question with reference to this thing is about our economic relations with Russia. Sir. I had been to Ludhiana only a few weeks back. And I came to know that the orders from Russia to our country were overdue by several months. Will the Gorbachov meeting which is coming also coincide with our economic meetings about the bilateral trade relations?

Sir, with regard to the second statement, the hon. Minister has stated that he visited Rome, Brussels, Paris, London, Bonn and Tokyo in connection with the South African issue. Now, with regard to the South African issue, as my friend. Mr. Jaswant Singh, has stated, we have undertaken to be the Chair person of a Fund, called the Africa Fund to finance them. If, as the Minister has kindly stated that there was a coincidence of similirity of views given by the foreign ministers of the countries, has he also talked with these countries to find out that in the event of an economic embargo. being put into force by South Africa on the frontline States of Africa, will these countries also come and contribute to the Fund that we are creating for the purpose? Thank you.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, may I at the outset wish a long tenure to my friend, Mr. Narayan Dutt Tiwari, because I love him. in the Ministry of External Affairs, a long and meaningful tenure?

Sir, I raise a few specific questions. I do not want to traverse the same ground that my colleagues have already covered.

Firstly, I would like to know whether all the frontline States in South Africa are united to face the menace, the onslaught of South Africa. Is it not a fact that among the frontline States, two States. Swaziland and Lesotho are not in this? Why these two frontline States have been left out or have kept themselves out?

Secondly, Sir, when comprehensive sanctions or limited sanctioned are, applied against South Africa, the pressure on these frontline states will be felt more and more in the future. I am told that there is no way of reaching these frontline States through the sea, there is no adequate arrangement and in fact there is no infrastructur through which supplies can be made by other countries to these frontline States if they are going to suffer as a result of the boycott of South African goods to these areas and prevention of import and export of goods of these States through South African ports. If South Africa were to prevent. or ban, the exports

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

and imports of the commodities produced by these frontline States, what are the outlets which are visualised to provide economic assistance to these States by other nation of the world? Is it possible to have the airlift of goods and commodities like the one that America did in West Berlin years past? Is it feasible? Has this problem been thought of by the Government?

Thirdly, India is the Chairman of the Fund of the Non-Aligned group to help these frontline States. Sir, we are all not very rich countries. Most fo the Non-Aligned countries are poor. Naturally the contributions of these countries are also not very very sizeable. Is there any plan of the Non-Aligned group to mobilise resources from other countries, which are not non-aligned? What is the plan? Fourthly, what is the quantum of assistance that has been decided upon, whether any assessment of the needs and demands of these frontline States has been made and if it has been made. whether the quantum of the funds that have been assessed, and fixed? Lastly, I would like the Minister to tell us a little more as to which are the countries which he visited which are more intransigent and are not very much responsive to the call of the non-aligned, to apply sanctions against South Africa.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Sir, I express my views with pain and pleasure. It is painful to see that there are very frequent changes in the Ministry; but it is very pleasant to find that fortunately there is no change in our policy. The foreign policy of India and of other frontline African countries to put an end to the apartheid is to apply comprehensive mandatory sanctions. We are emphatically addressing every forum and conference and because of our earnest efforts, there is a positive response in so many West-European countries, Japan and including the United States. But the unfortunate position is that still some of the African countries are having relations with the Government of South Africa for getting coal, power and other commodities from the Government under botha. I would like to know whether NAM has taken any step to give instructions to those African countries to severe their relations in all aspects with the Botha Government. At the same time; South Africa Government under Botha has also proposed some sanctions against other South African countries so that there is a heavy loss in their economic development. I want to know whether NAM countries have proposed anything to meet these losses and how we are going to meet this challenge. We are happy to know that Comrade Gorbachev is coming to our country, and I welcome it. I would like to know as to what are the constructive proposals evolved by the Government of India during this visit and in what way we are going to further improve our economic, social and political relations and other matters during the visit of Comrade Gorbachev.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, in the first instance I am very happy that Shri N. D. Tiwari could assure us that Comrade Gorbachev is committed to the friendship with India. This becomes important because there were a few reports that there was a slight shift in the stands subsequent to the process of normalisation of relations between China and the Soviet Union. The assurance of the Minister is really welcome. But then I have one query to make. I would like to ask the Minister whether there was any discussion regarding the possibility of a new Indo-Soviet Friendship Treaty being taken up in the coming visit of General Secretary Comrade Gorbachev.

Regarding Shri Tiwari's visit to some of the industrialised countries, I have a few questions. In the first instance I would like to ask whether there was any difference in the stand taken by countries like Italy, Britain, West Germany, on the one hand and Belgium, France and Japan on the other regarding the sanctions to be imposed against South Africa.

Secondly, Sir, in these discussions with the Foreign Ministers of all these countries, did the External Affairs Minister only discuss the question of sanctions or did he also discuss the possibility of their contributing to the Fund which could help the frontline States? The point is, they have difficulties as expressed to him about imposing sanctions in the way in which they have to be imposed as we feel they have to be imposed. But did they at least have consideration for contributing to the Fund which could be used by the frontline States?

Now, Sir, the position is quite clear that these industrialised countries are not going to stand by the NAM countries in regard to the imposition of sanctions against South Africa. While I have got all admiration for our External Affairs Minister for going into mutual appreciation of our stand by them and their stand by us and so on and so forth, I would like to know categorically what efforts will be made by India in particular, and the NAM countries in general, to counter the stand taken by these industrialised countries? What further steps will be taken by India and the NAM countries to make the sanctions against South Africa effective? Thank you, Sir.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, first of all, in all humility and with gratefulness, I would like to thank all my hon. friends who have given me their good wishes and, I would say, personal blessings. My greatest asset has been this personal consideration, friendly consideration and affection bestowed on my humble self by my distinguished friends and I will continue to cherish it, in the course of fulfilling my duties to this House and in the onerous task and responsibility which has been bestowed on me.

First of all, I would like to mention about my visit to the Soviet Union. I have mentioned it in the very first line that it was in connection with the forthcoming visit of General Secretary Gorbachev to India. It was not my intention to engage myself—I hope the hon. House will agree—in any substantive discussions when General Secretary Gorbachev himself was coming here to discuss these matters with our Prime Minister and substantive decisions were to be taken here, in India, during the Delhi meeting. Therefore, while I touched upon substantive issues during my discussions, as I have already mentioned, I thought it appropriate that I should not myself in any way diminish the capabilities of General Secretary Gorbachev by committing him to any specific stand on any particular matter when he himself was coming to India within a few days. It was an exploratory visit in the sense that I probed certain problems and ideas which could form the agenda for the forthcoming discussions. Therefore, if my statement is somewhat general, I hope, hon. Members will appreciate that my task was not to engage myself in any substantive discussions which may lead to substantive decisions, but was only exploratory and it was also meant to discuss the basic agenda for the talks.

As far as the agenda is concerned, of course, the two leaders will frame their own agenda. But the broad agenda which we have proposed is that there should be a general declaration, there should be a general

[Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari]

statement of views, there should be an economic agreement, the details of which are under discussion as of now. Some protocols are under discussion which could be signed. One regarding coal has been initialled just two or three days back. So, the process of discussion is going on, but there should be an economic agreement. Also there are proposals to have some agreement on opening consulates, on the consular status. There are two or three proposals. So, particularly these four decisions or statements might be taken up during the course of the visit of the General Secretary Gorbachev.

Regarding the Reykjavik summit, of course, this was discussed at some length but again, as I said, the position regarding Reykjavik summit on behalf of India also has to be stated in this Delhi meeting, which I hope will form part of the Delhi Declaration—our stand on that and the Soviet stand on that. But certainly, Mr. Shevardnadze, hon. Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, mentioned to me about the reasons which led to the failure of the Reykjavik summit. He mentioned that he was going to Vienna and as I have mentioned in my statement, the next morning he left for Vienna to further discuss the matter with the Secretary of States Shultz, and in the papers you might have seen that this formed an agenda of discussion with Mr. Shultz in some detail. Yesterday also we read that the Chief Soviet Negotiator had put on the table for discussions a comprehensive agenda for partial disarmament and that is still under discussion. So, we know the things as they are moving and the Delhi Declaration will touch on these matters.

Now in a broad way I have mentioned about our stand. Hon. Members mentioned about the response of the Prime Minister, that it was an impromptu statement. I would say, whether it was impromptu or otherwise, it was a positive reaction on behalf of the Government of India and I hope on behalf of the people of India. I think that also represents the sentiments of hon. Members, hon. friends opposite also because, I think, there is a consensus about what should have been achieved in the Reykjavik talks and what should be achieved in the field of disarmament. I think there is a broad consensus on that in this country and in this Parliament.

Regarding my discussions with the European industrialised countries in Japan, first of all, I would like to humbly point out that we were there to fulfil the mandate of the NAM summit leaders. We were mandated that eight foreign ministers should visit the leading industrialised countries and then they named five to six countries which we visited. We have not been to the United States as a group. As you know, now the mantle of leadership of the NAM has fallen on Zimbabwe and the Zimbabwe Foreign Minister was the coordinator and convenor of our delegation. We have decided that he will report to the Chairman of the NAM, Excellency Mr. Mugabe. And then if they decide we might have to have another round of discussions with the industrialised countries and we might have even to go to USA to discuss the matter further with Mr. Shultz as was suggested. But as of new, Mr. Mugabe, the Foreign Minister of Zimbabwe, will report the matter to the Chairman of the non-aligned Movement, and then further discussions will follow. If I have referred to 101 Heads of States. I have referred to them only in this context, but later on, the hon. Member, Shri Nirmalbabu. will see that I have mentioned that this is the key moral issue facing our generation and we have mentioned the world community as a whole. which means the people of the world. So, this point is very

well taken. but I have referred in my statement many times about the wish of the world community about the desires, about he manifestation of the desires of the world community, the abhorrence against apartheid and the universality of condemnation of this immoral apartheid regime in Pretoria. I mentioned about it.

There are other points that have been mentioned very appropriately I think about Africa Fund. We did not, as a delegation, ask for donations to Africa Fund because our mandate did not directly and officially ask us to do so. But we did informally and I personally expressed the same desire and wish that the hon. Members have expressed. We have conveyed to all the Foreign Ministers we have met that they should contribute to Africa Fund, because it was indirectly mentioned to us that this Fund is not confined to the Non Aligned countries; the develoved countries could also contribute to this Fund. As a matter of fact, one or two countries did express their desire that they would contribute to Africa Fund.

The anguish shown by our hon. friends regaring the agony being suffered by the people of the frontline States while fighting South African apartheid regime is well taken. We know that the frontline States are in great difficulty and we also know that there are two States which my hon. friend, Mr. Gurupadaswamy mentioned, which are in a geographical situation in which South Africa can inffuence them to a large extent. So we know that there are two-three States which are in great difficulty. We hope that it will be politically and economically possible for them to openly join. Their people are against apartheid; their people are against the Pretoria regime. But it is difficult for them economically and politically, because of the geo-political situation, because of the geographical situation, to come out openly against the South African regime as of now. But we are sure that later on, as the situation develops, they will come out openly. There is no doubt about it. There are other frontline States, the weakest link being Mozambique because that is the country which is in the greatest difficulty; after the demise of late President Machel, Mozambique is in great difficulty. So there is every need for help being given to these frontline States. India is doing that. As a matter of fact, we sent a special planeload by air of medicines, food and all that to help Mozambique recently and we will do it further also. But we are mobilising, the Nam movement is mobilising support for the frontline States. Africa Fund itself is meant to help the frontline States.

There is another foud called SDDC which has already been created for long-term development, especially economic development of frontline States. Many countries are already contributing to the SDDC and we were told by the European Economic Community—the EEC—at Burssels that they would more than double their aid to the SDDC programme. So there are two funds—the Africa Fund and the SDDC Fund. So we hope that many countries will help in this Africa Fund also. All the Foreign Ministers told us informally that they would be asking their governments, their leaders, the Heads of State, to consider the resolution of the NAM Heads of State and also for contributing to the Africa Fund.

Regarding how the funds will be apportioned out of the Africa Fund, a meeting of officials is being convened this month at Lusaka to frame the outlines of this Fund, the modus operandi under which this Fund will be operated upon. Then there will be a ministerial level meeting to further elaborate the recommendations, to further consider the recommendations of this meeting of the officials and then we will have a meeting in which specific economic help or financial help will be pledged to the cause of the Fund. This meeting will be a sort of culmination of all these

[Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari]

efforts. So, we are sure that not only the non-aligned countries but all counrties, even the rich countries, will come forward to the help of the front-line States to help substantially, to contribute substantially to the Africa Fund, and then, thereupon this Africa Fund Committee, under the chairmanship of India and vice-chairmanship of Zimbabwe—there is a committee of eight or 10 members—will frame rules as to how the funds have to be distributed. ... (*Interruptions*) ... Zambia is the Vice-President. This committee will frame rules as to how the funds will be *disbursed. I am sure the unanimous* voice expressed by this august House will certainly be reflected in full measure in the determination of the people of this country to fight apartheid.

We fought apartheid all these years. Since 1946 we have comprehensive economic sanctions, even though there are more than one million people of Indian origin in South Africa, against that country. This great Parliament and we are united to fight apartheid and let us hope that the countries the world over will join us.

I myself said what Nirmal Babu has said in his speech, that there are vested interests; they might be multinationals or non-multinationals. Whoever it might be, there are vested interests in many countries who are now supporting apartheid. It is a shame that in some countries of the world there are forces which are still living in a world of their own, a racist world. We condemn that. But we have to move peacefully. We have no option but to move peacefully ahead. The only peaceful option left is to have these mandatory economic sanctions. I also think that this matter will come up before the United Nations also in the near future at an appropriate occasion when this question will be debated upon in the United Nations itself that mandatory economic sanctions should be applied under the UN Charter. With these words, Sir, I am very grateful to the honourable Members for their response and their support to our proposals.

THE DOCK WORKERS SAFETY, HEALTH AND WELFARE BILL, 1985—CONTD

SHRI P. N. SUKUL (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support this very welcome piece of legislation. I call it "welcome" because, on the one hand it is going to reduce the multiplicity of existing laws concerning dock workers and, on the other, the definition of "dock worker" is now being slightly amended so as to enlarge its scope to cover a larger number of workers under this Bill.

To be precise, this enactment proposes to replace (1) the Indian Dock Labourers Act, 1934, (2) the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 and (3) the Dock Workers (Safety, Health and Welfare) Scheme, 1961. So, now there will be one single enactment in place of there, and it is a really welcome step because, as I said, the multiplicity of laws on the subject is going to be reduced.

Sir, as regards the Bill, it is all right except at a few places. For example, in clause 2 where definitions are given, under sub-clauses 2(e) and 2 (f), while defining "dock worker" and "employer", the phrase "whether for remuneration or not" is used. This phrase "whether for remuneration or not" occurs at both these places. Why should somebody work for no remuneration, without remuneration? And if somebody works without remuneration, then, he is not a wage-earner. And if he is not a wage-earner, then, he cannot be covered under the definition of "worker". To that extent the very enactment becomes meanigless. So, I think,